



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,787	08/28/2003	Rajesh K. Garg	021238-578	5592

21839 7590 07/24/2006

BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC  
POST OFFICE BOX 1404  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

FORTUNA, JOSE A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1731

DATE MAILED: 07/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/649,787

**Applicant(s)**

GARG ET AL.

**Examiner**

José A. Fortuna

**Art Unit**

1731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/06/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on May 16, 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the other groups are subcombinations of the first. This is not found persuasive because applicants have not point out any error(s) in the restriction. Moreover, as discussed in the previous office action the other groups are more than subcombinations of the first, since they claim different products, i.e. a paper web, a slurry for cigarette a feed stock and a system. The claims have some limitations that are common to them, but they claims contains limitations that are not in the other claims and that make the groups different, see previous action.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

As to the Burden of search, the MPEP 803 states:

"For purposes of the initial requirement, a serious burden on the examiner may be prima facie shown if the examiner shows by appropriate explanation of separate classification, or separate status in the art, or a different field of search as defined in MPEP § 808.02. That prima facie showing may be rebutted by appropriate showings or evidence by the applicant. Insofar as the criteria for restriction practice relating to Markush-type claims is concerned, the criteria is set forth in MPEP § 803.02. Insofar as the criteria for restriction or election practice relating to claims to genus-species, see MPEP §806.04(a) - §806.04(i) and § 808.01(a)."

Applicant's arguments do not point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement

2. Claims 6-22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on May 16, 2006.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gautam et al., US Patent No. 5,997,691.

Gautam et al. teach a method of making a web in which a base web is moved along a first path, a slurry of cellulosic material is prepared as and add-on to the base

web; and repetitive discharging the add-on-material, see for example, paragraph bridging columns 2 and 3. In the same paragraph, Gautam et al. teach that the add-on material is discharged using a moving belt having an orifice along the endless path, same as claim 2 of the current application. Gautam et al. teach also the use of flax straw as the add-on material, see column 12, lines 43-57 and in the same paragraph, Gautam et al. teach that the add-on material is cooked, bleached and then grinded, i.e., refined. The only difference between the claimed invention and Gautam et al. invention is that the way in which the add-on material is ground, i.e., Gautam et al. teach a wet grinding process, while the present application teaches the dry comminution<sup>1</sup> of the add-on materials. However, using either process of grinding is within the levels of ordinary skill in the art, since both of them are very well known in the art. Note that if one desires to do the dry grinding operation, then the steps of pressing and drying the slurry are a necessary and also very well known in the dry market pulp. Wet and dry grinding are functional equivalent processes and it has been held that “[W]here two equivalents are interchangeable for their desired function, substitution would have been obvious and thus, express suggestion of desirability of the substitution of one for the other is unnecessary.” In re Fout 675 F. 2d 297, 213 USPQ 532 (CCPA 1982); In re Siebentritt, 372 F.2d 566, 152 USPQ 618 (CCPA 1967). With regard to claims 4 and 5, the steps of removing shives and contaminants from a pulp is very well known and necessary step(s) after the cooking of the pulp<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> For example of dry grinding operation see US Patent Nos. 3,596,840; 3,847,363; 3,987,969; 4,166,583; 4,191,335; just to mention a few. All of them cited on PTO-892, attached.

<sup>2</sup> See for example Chapter 9, Pages 98-132, of Handbook for pulp and paper technologists, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, attached.

Art Unit: 1731


***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure in the art of "Method of adding add-on materials to cellulosic webs."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José A. Fortuna whose telephone number is 571-272-1188. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
José A Fortuna  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1731

JAF